

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

Qadim Ruach El, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	Civil Action No. 2:17-1915-RMG
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER AND OPINION</b>
	)	
Susan Chang, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, recommending the complaint be summarily dismissed without prejudice and without service. Plaintiffs assert claims against numerous law enforcement personnel, social service workers, judges, the Charleston County Clerk of Court, the Charleston County Family Court, the Governor, and private individuals concerning a March 2017 incident. In that incident, a Charleston County Sheriff's Deputy, attempting to serve a warrant on another individual, approached Plaintiffs' apartment and observed two minor children home alone with drug paraphernalia on the floor. Plaintiffs allege the deputy illegally coaxed the children to open the door, which led to the discovery of a loaded rifle in the apartment. Plaintiff Qadim Ruach El was charged with child endangerment. The children were taken into protective custody after the incident.

Plaintiffs Qadim Ruach El and Ameenah Adilah El filed the present action on July 19, 2017. They listed their two minor children as Plaintiffs as well. On August 29, 2017, the Court entered a proper form order, directing Plaintiffs to obtain counsel for their minor children. Plaintiffs have not complied with that order. The Magistrate Judge recommended summary dismissal on January 10, 2018. Plaintiffs filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation.

Non-attorney parents may not litigate the claims of their minor children in federal court. *Myers v. Loudoun Cnty. Public Schs.*, 418 F.3d 395,401 (4th Cir. 2005). The Court therefore dismisses without prejudice all claims asserted on behalf of the minor children.

Plaintiffs Qadim Ruach El and Ameenah Adilah El assert claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against state or local officials. The Court agrees fully with the Magistrate Judge's comprehensive analysis of the complaint. The complaint is incomprehensible "Moorish National" gibberish. Essentially, Plaintiffs seek the return of their children. The complaint, however, names Defendants with absolute immunity, private actor Defendants not subject to liability under § 1983, and Defendants that are not "persons" under § 1983. More fundamentally, this Court does not hear appeals from the Charleston County Family Court or interfere with pending state criminal proceedings. *See D.C. Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 476–82 (1983); *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 44 (1971).

The Court therefore **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Dkt. No. 22) as the Order of the Court and **DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** the complaint.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Mark Gergel  
United States District Court Judge

January 22, 2018  
Charleston, South Carolina